UNITED S\ ..ES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and ..ademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/302,108	09/07/94	CLAPP	D 19676.1US01

B3M1/0121

MERCHANT GOULD SMITH EDELL
WELTER & SCHMIDT
3100 NORWEST CENTER
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402-4131

EXAMINER	
CHEN, A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2317	11

DATE MAILED: 01/21/97

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

☑ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/6/96 Amendment A.

☑ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☑ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☑ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☑ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892

☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

-- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES --

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's Amendment A filed on November 6, 1996 in response to Examiner's Office Action has been reviewed.

2. Claims 1-53 are presented for examination.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

4. Shibata was cited as prior art in the previous Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gattis et al US Patent no 5,062,136 and in combination with Steinka et al US Patent no 5,134,611.

7. As to Claim 1, Gattis et al (Gattis) discloses a system for communicating with a communication channel and a separate host processor, the separate host processor being housed within a computer system housing and being coupled to a display (abstract).

Gattis does not explicitly disclose a peripheral housing separate from the computer system housing. However, Gattis notes that the invention can be added as an internal peripheral OR as a external peripheral connected to the host computer system by a standard or serial interface (Col 3 Lines 25-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the conferencing system in a peripheral exterior housing as a design choice.

Gattis does not explicitly discloses the audio/visual communication system (television conferencing system, Col 3, Lines 63-64) comprises a source input interface that receives a source audio signal and a source video signal. However, Gattis discloses that the source video signal (video camera, Col 3 Lines 68-69) is provided to the video grabber which would be the input interface. Gattis does not explicitly disclose the source audio interface is also received at the local interface. However, it is well known in the art that the video camera will capture audio signals also and Gattis provides that audio signal can be accommodated in the video transmission by the addition of another bit (Col 4 Lines 65-66). Therefore, the audio portion of the signal would be included also in the video input.

Gattis discloses a local transmission interface that transmits the source audio signal and the source video signal (Col 4 Lines 25-31). Gattis does not explicitly disclose that the interface selectably transmit between an analog or a digital communication channel. However, Gattis discloses that the communication channel is a telephone line which is an analog channel. Therefore in this particular embodiment, the communication channel is analog. Further, Gattis discloses that the invention is compatible with other networks such as ISDN which is a digital

network (Col 5 Lines 18-19). Since the invention is compatible with an analog channel and digital channel, the interface will inherently select between an analog or digital communication channel.

Further, Steinka et al (Steinka) discloses an interface which selects communicating between a digital and an analog network (Col 3 Lines 24-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the two references since they are directed communication networks. Furthermore, the addition of having the ability to switch between digital and analog networks as a necessary bridge as the analog network is phased toward a digital network (Steinka, Col 1 Lines 42-46).

Gattis discloses a local receive (decryptor, Col 4 Lines 32-41) interface that receives a remote audio signal and a remote video signal transmitted. Gattis does not explicitly disclose the communication channel is analog or digital but Gattis discloses that the device is compatible with both types of channels or for the reasoning of the combination with Steinka.

Gattis discloses an output interface comprising an output connector that communicates the remote video signal between the local receive interface and the output connector (Col 4 Lines 35-41) wherein the separate host processor, when coupled to the output connector, receives the remote video signal for displaying a corresponding video image on the display.

8. As to Claim 2, Gattis discloses wherein the local transmission interface means comprised coding circuit (encoder/compressor) that converts the source audio and video signals to associated coded audio and video signals of a predetermined digital format (Col 4 Lines 19-31).

9. As to Claim 3, Gattis discloses wherein the local receive interface comprises a decoding circuit that converts remote coded audio and video signals of a predetermined format received over the communication channel to associated remote decoded audio and video signal (Col 4 Lines 32-41).

10. As to Claim 4, the references do not explicitly disclose the local receive interface comprises means for automatically the format of the remote coded audio and video signal. However, in order to be able to decompress the remote data, the format of the coded audio and video signal will have to be automatically detected. Also, since Gattis discloses that the invention is compatible with analog and digital networks, it is inherent that invention will be able to discern between an analog and digital format.

11. As to Claim 5, the references do not explicitly disclose the interface receives at the output connector a coordination instruction produced by the separate host processor and communicates the coordination instruction between the output connector and the local receive interface. However, it is well known in the art that since the invention will be coordinate from software running from the host processor. It would be inherent that coordination instructions would be produced by the separate host processor and the instruction is communicated to the interface.

12. As to Claim 6, the references do not explicitly disclose wherein the output interface comprises of an SCSI interface and a PCMCIA interface. However, Gattis discloses the interface connected by a serial or parallel interface (Col 3 Lines 27-28), it is well within the skill of one of

ordinary skill in the art to choose SCSI and/or PCMCIA interface because they are standard interfaces in the industry connecting host computers with peripherals.

13. As to Claim 7, the reference does not explicitly disclose that source input interface comprises means for receiving the source video signal in one of a plurality of predetermined video formats. However, Gattis discloses that the source video is digitized (Col 4 Lines 1-3). The digitization process follow standards such as CCITT H. 261 which puts data into a predetermined format. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for receiving the source video signal in a predetermined format in order to be compliant with standards.

14. As to Claim 8, Gattis discloses the source input interface comprises means for receiving the source video signal from a video camera. Gattis does not explicitly disclose the input interface also includes receiving audio signal from a microphone. However, microphones are well known in the art of teleconferencing and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include microphone receiving in order to facilitate audio communication. Gattis does not disclose a video media player. However, video media players are a source of video and it would be well within the scope of use for this communication system.

15. As to Claim 9, Steinka discloses the local transmission means comprises channel selection means for selectably transmitting the source audio and video signals over one of an analog communication channel and a digital channel.

16. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gattis and Steinka as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shibata et al US Patent no 5,477,546.

17. As to Claim 10, the references do not explicitly disclose the local receive interface comprises a speaker for broadcasting audio reproduced from the remote audio signal. Shibata discloses a speaker/microphone (14, Fig 1) in the apparatus (Col 6 Lines 34-39). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the three references since they are directed at communications over a network. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to add a speaker to the local receive means to reproduce remote audio signal since the apparatus is utilized as a video conferencing system.

18. Claims 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gattis and Steinka as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hata et al US Patent no 5,351,076.

19. As to Claim 11, the two references do not explicitly disclose the local transmission means interface comprises a data file processor that transmits a data file over the communication channel. Hata et al (Hata) discloses a local transmission means interface comprises a data file processor that transmits a data file over the communication channel (Col 7 Lines 42-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the three references since they are directed at communicating over a network. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to add a data file processor that transmits a data file in order to send processed data

from the computer system to the remote system by the video telephone system (Col 2 Lines 39-42).

20. As to Claim 12, the references do not explicitly disclose the local transmission interface comprises a converter that converts a standard data file to a coded data file of a predetermined format. However, it is well known in the art that data compression is often used in data transmission because of the saving in bandwidth. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to send files through the compressor as taught by Gattis in order to save bandwidth.

21. As to Claims 13-18, Gattis and Steinka substantially disclose the invention as claimed as detailed above. Gattis and Steinka do not explicitly disclose software that cooperates with to coordinate communication of the remote video signal between the local receive means and the output connector. However, it is well known in the art that in order for a computer based system to implement its functions, there has to be software to coordinate its activities. The system taught by Gattis and Steinka would inherently have software to coordinate communication of the remote video signal between the local receive means and the output connector.

Further Hata discloses that a mouse is used to operate the video terminal and the personal computer with operation data (Col 5 Lines 15-17). This implies the existence of software that coordinates communication of the remote video signal between the local receive means and the output connector.

22. Claims 19-53 are rejected for the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent:	Issued:	Inventor:	Filed:
4,797,750	Jan 1989	Karweit	Apr 1986
4,893,326	Jan 1990	Duran et al	May 1987
5,369,617	Nov 1994	Munson	Dec 1993
5,483,530	Jan 1996	Davis et al	Dec 1996
5,495,485	Feb 1996	Hughes-Hartogs	Feb 1995
5,515,423	May 1996	Beck et al	Dec 1993
5,550,649	Aug 1996	Wong et al	May 1992
5,587,928	Dec 1996	Jones et al	May 1994

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Anderson Chen, whose telephone number is (703) 305-9593 or via email, ***achen@uspto.gov***. The Examiner can 2normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Thomas C. Lee, can be reached at (703) 305-9717. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-5359.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Anderson Chen

January 16, 1997

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
230